22

25

24

Amendments to the specification have been made to correct minor typographical and grammatical errors.

Claims 1-47 were originally submitted.

Claim 10 is canceled without prejudice.

Claims 12 and 46 has been amended to include separate graphical areas for resources to be written and resources that have been written.

Claims 13 and 27 have been amended to overcome objections cited by the Office.

Claims 17, 19, 23, 25, 26, 31, 33, and 38 have been amended to correct antecedent errors.

Claims 12 and 46 have been amended to recite an operating system program or functions performed by an operating system program.

Claims 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 41, 43 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ahead Software's Nero program (Nero).

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 28, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero, in view of U.S. Patent 5,946,277 to Kuroda et al (Kuroda).

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero and Kuroda, in view of U.S. Patent 6,499,095 to Sexton et al (Sexton).

Claims 11 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero and Kuroda, in view of U.S. Patent 6,640,269 to Stewart (Stewart).

Claims 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero and Kuroda, in view of US. Patent 6,678,764 to Paravelscu et al (Paravelscu).

Claims 24 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero in view of Sexton.

Claims 26, 34 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero in view of Stewart.

Claims 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero, in view of Sexton, in further view of Stewart, and in further view of Kuroda.

Claims 1-9, 11-47 remain in this application.

Examiner Interview

Examiner Interview was conducted by telephone on June 11, 2004 with Examiners Boris Pesin and Kathleen Kincaid, and Emmanuel Rivera.

It was discussed that the cited reference of Nero is a stand alone application program that is ran on a computer through the use of an operating system. Mr. Rivera pointed out that claims are directed to an operating system which is distinguished from the stand-alone application program described in Nero.

No agreement was reached during the interview as to allowance of any claims or amendments to the claims to place them in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 41, 43 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ahead Software's Nero program (Nero). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Amended independent claim 17 recites

A graphical user interface for a computer, comprising:

an operating system that interacts with a user to manage computer resources;

the operating system having a resource browser that is responsive to user input to explore resource areas containing different types of resources and to display icons that represent the resources, at least some of the resources being physically moveable to and from the resource areas by moving their corresponding icons;

at least one of the resource areas being a staged-write resource area;

the resource browser being configured to define a stored resource display area and a staged resource display area, the stored resource display area showing icons of resources that are already stored in the staged-write resource area, the staged resource display area showing icons of staged resources that the user desires to be written to a writable resource area of the staged-write resource area but that have not yet been written to said writable resource area.

Nero fails to teach or disclose the graphical user interface of claim 17.

Nero describes an application program to "burn" or record files (i.e., data resources) to a writeable medium such as a compact disc (CD). A browser area (shown as "File Browser" in Fig. 1 of Nero) is provided that describes files available from resources such as a disc drive ("C" drive is illustrated in Fig. 1) on a computer. Files (e.g., element 2 of Fig. 1 of Nero) are chosen and written to a

writeable medium such as a compact disc (CD) (the writeable medium is represented as "NFW" of Fig. 1). Files that have been written and files to be written on the writeable medium are displayed in the same browser area associated with the writeable medium. No distinction is made as to a separate stored resource area and a staged-write resource area.

Claim 17 recites "an operating system that interacts with a user to manage computer resources". Nero is directed to an application program.

The words of a claim must be given their "plain meaning", where "plain meaning" refers to the meaning given to the term by those of ordinary skill in the See MPEP 2111.01. "Words in patent claims are given their ordinary meaning in the usage of the field of the invention, unless the text of the patent makes clear a word was used with a special meaning". MPEP 2111.01 citing Toro Co. v. White Consol. Indus., Inc., 199 F.3d 1295, 1299 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

The words "operating system" have not been given a special meaning in the specification of patent application, and it is Applicants' intent that "operating system" be given its ordinary meaning as given to the term by those of ordinary skill in the art.

It is appropriate to compare the meaning of terms given in technical dictionaries in order to ascertain the accepted meaning of a term in the art. In re-Barr, 444 F.2d 588, 170 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1971).

The website http://www.computeruser.com/resources/dictionary provides the following definition for "operating system":

The main control program of a computer that schedules tasks, manages storage, and handles communication with peripherals. Its main part, called the kernel, is always present. The operating system presents a basic user interface when no applications are open, and all applications must communicate with the operating system.

Website http://www.computeruser.com/resources/dictionary provides the following definition for "application program":

A program that helps the user accomplish a specific task; for example, a word processing program, a spreadsheet program, or an FTP client. Application programs should be distinguished from system programs, which control the computer and run the application programs, and utilities, which are small assistance programs.

Also, the website http://www.webopedia.com/ provides the following definition which distinguishes an operating system and an application program.

A program or group of programs designed for end users. Software can be divided into two general classes: systems software and applications software. Systems software consists of low-level programs that interact with the computer at a very basic level. This includes operating systems, compilers, and utilities for managing computer resources. In contrast, applications software (also called end-user programs) includes database programs, word processors, and spreadsheets. Figuratively speaking, applications software sits on top of systems software because it is unable to run without the operating system and system utilities. (emphasis added).

There is a clear distinction between "operating system" and "application program" as indicated above. Nero is limited to an application program. Nero does not disclose or teach that its application program may be included as part of an operating system.

To support the rejection of claim 1 under §102(e), Nero would have to show every element, configured as recited in the claim. Claim 17 recites features of an operating system, and Nero does not. Accordingly, Nero does not show every element of claim 17, and the rejection of claim 17 is therefore improper.

In addition to the elements discussed above relating to an operating system, claim 17 also recites "the resource browser being configured to define a stored resource display area and a staged resource display area, the stored resource display area showing icons of resources that are already stored in a writable resource associated with the staged-write resource area, the staged resource display area showing icons of staged resources that the user desires to be written the writable resource but that have not yet been written to said writable resource".

The Office argues that Fig. 1 "element 3" of Nero discloses a staged-write resource area. The Office does not present where Nero discloses separate "stored resource display area" and "staged resource display area" which distinctively show icons of resources that have been written and icons of stage resources that are to be written. The Office argues that Nero (in Fig. 11) provides a user advisory that files written in grey are files that have been already written, while files in black are to be written. However, this is not the same as separate "stored resource display" and "staged resource display" areas.

For this additional reason, Nero fails to show each and every element of claim 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 17 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 25 are allowable based at the least on their dependency on claim 17.

Furthermore, claim 19 recites "the resource browser is further configured, upon writing the staged resources, to write additional resources not specifically designated by the user for use in conjunction with the staged resources after they are written". The Office argues that this is disclosed in Fig. 7, element 1 of Nero. Element 1, however, is another writeable medium (identified as a CD ROM), not a resource that is written to the "writable resource". Furthermore, although the Office Action mentions the ability to write a "bootable CD", there is no indication that such a bootable CD would contain any resources that would be useful "in conjunction with the staged resources after they are written", as recited by claim 19. Accordingly, Nero does not show this additional element recited by claim 19, and claim 19 is allowable for this additional reason.

Claim 20 recites "automatically identifying a viewer program that is compatible with one or more of the staged resources; writing the viewer program to the storage medium for use in conjunction with the staged resources after they are written." The Office uses the same reference, Fig. 7, element 1 that was used in rejecting claim 19. The Office makes the assumption that Nero performs this action; however, at no point does Nero show anything even hinting at "automatically identifying a viewer program . . ." as recited by claim 20. With regard to Nero's ability to create a bootable CD, Nero does not disclose that this might involve "automatically identifying a viewer program . . ." Accordingly, Nero does not show this additional element recited by claim 20, and claim 20 is allowable for this additional reason.

Claim 21 recites "wherein the resource browser alters the icons to indicate the status of the staged resources". The Office argues that resources or files that are to be written (i.e., staged) are capitalized, as shown in element 1 of Fig. 8. However,

the text that is capitalized does not comprise an "icon" as recited in claim 21. Furthermore, it is not apparent from Fig. 8 that element 1 is actually a resource to be written – there is no corresponding element in lower case in the C: browser area. In other words, element 1 is "BORLUND_LOG", and the corresponding highlighted resource in C: is "Borlund_JBuilder_8". Thus, Nero does not show this claimed element, and claim 21 is allowable for this additional reason.

Claim 22 recites that "some of the icons have status overlays corresponding to a staged status and an in-process status." The Office argues that Nero shows in element 1 Fig. 1 an overlay indicating status of writing to the medium; however, this overlay indicates an in burning status and does not provide an overlay as to a staged status. Thus Nero does not show this claimed element, and claim 21 is allowable for this additional reason.

Claim 23 recites "a contextually sensitive command area, wherein the resource browser includes a delete resource command in the contextually sensitive command area if and only if the particular type of writable resource area is rewritable". The Office argues that Fig. 10 of Nero shows a delete command function is contextually sensitive. However, nothing in this screen shot indicates that the delete command is contextually sensitive—that it is included "if and only if the particular type of writable resource is rewritable". Nero does not show this claimed characteristic, and claim 23 is allowable for this additional reason.

Claim 25 recites

prior to interacting with the user, the operating system pre-allocates a contiguous portion of mass storage for future use when writing identified resources to the writable resource area, wherein the pre-allocated portion is large enough to create a data image that is to be created on the writable resource area;

prior to writing the staged resources to said writable resource area, creating a data image in the pre-allocated portion of mass storage.

 The Office argues that Nero shows in Fig. 6 a cache that is set by default. However, this screen shot shows merely that a cache is used at some point, and that the user is allowed to set the size of the cache. There is absolutely no indication that this cache is "pre-allocate[d]" as recited by claim 25. Furthermore, Nero does not indicate that a pre-allocated portion "is large enough to create a data image that is to be created on the writable resource" as also recited by claim 25. Claim 25 is allowable for this additional reason.

Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 25 be withdrawn.

Claim 27 recites in part "an operating system that interacts with a user to manager computer resources", and that operating system has a resource browser with characteristics as recited in the subsequent elements. As discussed above, Nero is directed to characteristics of an application program, rather than to elements of an operating system. Thus, Nero does not show an operating system having a resource browser with the recited characteristics and functionality. Accordingly, the 102 rejection of claim 27 is improper, and should be withdrawn.

In addition, claim 27 recites "the resource browser being configured to display icons of stored resources that are already stored in the staged-write resource area and icons of staged resources that the user desires to be written to the staged-write resource area but that have not yet been written to said staged-write resource area wherein the resource browser shows different representations of the resources depending upon whether they are stored resources or staged resources."

As discussed above, the area of Nero presented as element 3 of Fig. 1 does not provide for separate stored resource and staged resource areas. The Office argues that Fig. 1 "element 3" of Nero discloses a staged-write resource area. The

Office does not present where Nero discloses separate "stored resource display area" and "staged resource display area" which distinctively show icons of resources that have been written and icons of stage resources that are to be written. The Office argues that Nero (in Fig. 11) provides a user advisory that files written in grey are files that have been already written, while files in black are to be written. However, this is not the same as separate "stored resource display" and "staged resource display" areas. Therefore, element 3 of Fig. 1 further does not "display icons of stored resources that are already stored in the staged-write resource area and icons of staged resources that the user desires to be written to the staged-write resource area" as recited by claim 27.

Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 27 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 29, 30, 31, and 33 are allowable based at the least on their on their dependency on claim 27.

Claim 29 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 19.

Claim 30 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 20.

Claim 31 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 23.

Claim 33 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 25.

Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 29, 30, 31, and 33 be withdrawn.

Claim 41 recites in part "saving resources in response to requests from application programs; in response to receiving a request from an application program to save a resource on a staged-write storage medium, noting that resource as being staged without writing the resource".

Nero fails to teach or disclose that as an application program it is responsive to a request from another application program as recited in claim 41. The Office does not mention where in Nero this element of claim 41 is disclosed. Claim 41 is allowable for this additional reason, and Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claim 41 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 43 and 45 are allowable based at the least on their dependency on claim 41.

Claim 43 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 19.

Claim 45 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 25.

Applicants respectfully request that the §102 rejection of claims 43 and 45 be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 28, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero, in view of U.S. Patent 5,946,277 to Kuroda et al (Kuroda). Claim 10 has been cancelled and Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the other claims.

Independent claim 1 recites:

One or more computer readable media containing one or more operating system programs, said one or more programs comprising computer-readable instructions for performing a process comprising:

interacting with a user to manage computer resources, including graphically browsing different computer resource areas that contain resources managed by the operating system;

representing resources within the resource areas as icons, the resources being physically moveable to and from at least some of the resource areas by moving the icons;

at least one of the resource areas being a particular type of writable resource area to which resources can be written;

in response to browsing said at least one of the resource areas, defining a graphical staging area into which a user may move icons representing resources that are to be written to said at least one of the resource areas;

delaying any writing of the resources represented in the staging area until detecting a user attempt to remove a storage medium from said at least one of the resource areas;

in response to detecting the user attempt to remove the storage medium, identifying resources represented by the icons in the staging area and writing such identified resources to the storage medium.

The combination of Nero and Kuroda fail to teach or suggest the computer readable media of claim 1.

Claim 1 recites elements of "operating system programs" and is thus allowable for the reasons already discussed with regard to claim 17.

Kuroda is cited as teaching "the ability to hold of (sic, "off") on recording data until the eject button is pressed with the motivation to reduce the speed of the total recoding (sic, "recording") time because the data would only be recorded

once and not several times." However, Kuroda again does not teach elements of an operating system. Accordingly, neither of the two cited references suggest including the recited features as elements of an operating system. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 1.

Claim 2 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 25.

Claim 3 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 19.

Claim 4 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 20.

Claim 5 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 21.

Claim 6 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 22.

Claim 7 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 22.

Claim 8 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 23.

Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 12 particular recites "graphically representing the resources to be written on a separate area from resources that have been written to the storage medium".

The combination of Nero and Kuroda fail to teach or suggest the method of claim 12.

As discussed above, Nero does not describe separate graphical areas that describe resources that are to be written or resources that have been written to the storage medium. Nero describes a single graphical area that represents both types of resources, those that have been written and those to be written.

Kuroda is cited as teaching "when the ejection operation to eject the recording disk to the outside is performed, the file management data pieces recorded on the recording device are unified, then recorded on a predetermined area of the recording disk". However, Kuroda provides no suggestion of separate areas. Therefore, the combination of these two references, even combined, fail to suggest this characteristic. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 13, 15 and 16 are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 12.

Claim 15 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 19.

Claim 16 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 20.

Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 13, 15 and 16 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 18 depends from claim 17 and recites "the resource browser being configured to define a stored resource display area and a staged resource display area, the stored resource display area showing icons of resources that are already stored in the staged-write resource area, the staged resource

 display area showing icons of staged resources that the user desires to be written to a writable resource area of the staged-write resource area but that have not yet been written to said writable resource area". As discussed above, Nero does not teach or suggest separate "stored resource display" area that shows resources that already stored and a "staged resource display" area that shows resources to be written.

The ejection operation of Kuroda provides no assistance in light of Nero as to the recited graphical user interface of claim 18.

Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 18 be withdrawn.

Claim 28 depends from claim 27 and includes the element of "the resource browser being configured to display icons of stored resources that are already stored in the staged-write resource area and icons of staged resources that the user desires to be written to the staged-write resource area but that have not yet been written to said staged-write resource area; wherein the resource browser shows different representations of the resources depending upon whether they are stored resources or staged resources." As discussed above, the staged-write area of Nero presented as element 3 of Fig. 1 by the Office, does not provide for separate stored resource and staged resource areas. Element 3 of Fig. 1 further does not "display icons of stored resources that are already stored in the staged-write resource area and icons of staged resources that the user desires to be written to the staged-write resource area" and particularly does not teach or suggest "different representations of the resources depending upon whether they are stored resources or staged resources".

25 withdra

Kuroda is cited as teaching "when the ejection operation to eject the recording to the outside is performed, the file management data pieces recorded on the recording device are unified, then recording on a predetermined area of the recording disk". However, Kuroda provides no suggestion of different representations of the resources. Therefore, the combination of these two references, even combined, fail to suggest this characteristic. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 28 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 35 recites in part "One or more computer readable media containing an operating system program, the operating system program comprising: accepting designations of different resources managed by the operating system by a user for staging prior to writing to a removable storage medium."

Claim 35 is thus allowable for the reasons already discussed with regard to claim 17.

The combination of Nero and Kuroda fail to teach or suggest the readable media of claim 35.

Kuroda is cited as teaching "when the ejection operation to eject the recording disk to the outside is performed, the file management data pieces recorded on a predetermined area of the recording disk". However, Kuroda again does not teach elements of an operating system. Accordingly, neither of the two cited references suggest including the recited features as elements of an operating system. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 35 be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 35 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 36, 37, 38 and 40 are allowable at the least by virtue of their dependency on base claim 35.

Claim 36 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 19.

Claim 37 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 21.

Claim 38 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 23.

Claim 40 is additionally allowable for reasons similar to those presented above in support of claim 25.

Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 36, 37, 38 and 40 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 42 depends from claim 41 and recites "saving resources in response to requests from application programs; in response to receiving a request from an application program to save a resource on a staged-write storage medium, noting that resource as being staged without writing the resource".

As discussed above, Nero describes an application program. Nero does not teach or suggest that as a stand-alone application program it is capable of saving resources in response from request from other application programs.

The ejection operation of Kuroda provides no assistance in light of Nero as to the recited operating system of claim 42.

Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 42 be withdrawn.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero and Kuroda, in view of U.S. Patent 6,499,095 to Sexton et al (Sexton). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 9.

Dependent claim 9 depends from claim 1 and benefits from the arguments in support of claim 1 as to Nero and Kuroda.

The combination of Nero, Kuroda, and Sexton fail to teach or suggest the computer readable media of claim 9.

Sexton is cited as teaching "a numeric reference employs a machine-independent format for encoding references between objects that is suitable for both run-time use in virtual machines and storage use in secondary storage". However, Sexton does not teach elements of an operating system. Accordingly, none of the three cited references suggest including the recited features as elements of an operating system. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 9 be withdrawn.

Claims 11 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero and Kuroda, in view of U.S. Patent 5,946,277 to Stewart (Stewart). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 11 and 39.

Dependent claim 11 depends from claim 1 and benefits from the arguments in support of claim 1 as to Nero and Kuroda.

The combination of Nero, Kuroda, and Stewart fail to teach or suggest the graphical user interface of claim 11.

Stewart is cited for its teaching of a "locking mechanism with the motivation to provide the user with protection of writing over an undesired file". Stewart does not teach elements of an operating system. Accordingly, none of the

 three cited references suggest including the recited features as elements of an operating system. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 39 depends from claim 35 and benefits from the arguments in support of claim 35 as to Nero and Kuroda.

Furthermore, claim 39 recites "for any staged resource that is changed prior to writing, creating an unchanged copy of the staged resource; writing the unchanged copy in place of the changed staged resource".

The combination of Nero, Kuroda, and Stewart fail to teach or suggest the computer readable media of claim 11.

Stewart is cited as teaching "to produce the shared files using some conventional operating systems, including a filename or other identifier with which to name the file. The operating system may create the file and open it. Additionally, the operating system may lock the file in response to such a command in order to prohibit use of the file by other processes while the file is being written. The writer may receive from some conventional operating systems a pointer or other identifier of the file in response to the open for write command." The Office has not presented that an unchanged copy of the staged resource is written in place of the changed stage resource. What is described in Stewart is a pointer to a locked file. Stewart provides no assistance in light of Nero and Kuroda as to the recited computer readable media of claim 39.

Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 39 be withdrawn.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero and Kuroda, in view of U.S Patent 6,678,764 to Paravelescu et al (Paravelescu). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 14.

Dependent claim 14 depends from claim 12 and benefits from the arguments in support of claim 12 as to Nero and Kuroda.

The combination of Nero, Kuroda, and Paravelescu fail to teach or suggest the method of claim 14.

Paravelescu is cited as teaching "if media is not present, a beep or other warning and prompt to the user to insert media is issued". However, Paravelescu provides no suggestion of separate areas. Therefore, the combination of these three references, even combined, fail to suggest this characteristic. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

Claims 24 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero in view of Sexton. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 24 and 32.

Dependent claim 24 depends from claim 17 and includes the element of "the resource browser being configured to define a stored resource display area and a staged resource display area, the stored resource display area showing icons of resources that are already stored in the staged-write resource area, the staged resource display area showing icons of staged resources that the user desires to be written to a writable resource area of the staged-write resource area but that have not yet been written to said writable resource area".

 The combination of Nero and Sexton fail to teach or suggest the graphical user interface of claim 24.

As discussed above, Nero does not teach or suggest separate "stored resource display" area that shows resources that already stored and a "staged resource display" area that shows resources to be written.

Sexton is cited as teaching "a numeric reference employs a machine-independent format for encoding references between objects that is suitable for both run-time use in virtual machines and storage use in secondary storage". However, Sexton does not teach elements of "a stored resource display area and a staged resource display area". Therefore, the combination of these two references, even combined, fail to suggest this characteristic. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 24 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 32 depends from claim 27 and includes the element of "the resource browser being configured to display icons of stored resources that are already stored in the staged-write resource area and icons of staged resources that the user desires to be written to the staged-write resource area but that have not yet been written to said staged-write resource area; wherein the resource browser shows different representations of the resources depending upon whether they are stored resources or staged resources."

The combination of Nero and Sexton fail to teach or suggest the graphical user interface of claim 32.

As discussed above, the staged-write area of Nero presented as element 3 of Fig. 1 by the Office, does not provide for separate stored resource and staged resource areas. Element 3 of Fig. 1 further does not "display icons of stored"

resources that are already stored in the staged-write resource area and icons of staged resources that the user desires to be written to the staged-write resource area".

Sexton is cited as teaching "a numeric reference employs a machine-independent format for encoding references between objects that is suitable for both run-time use in virtual machines and storage use in secondary storage". However, Sexton does not teach elements of "display icons of stored resources that are already stored in the staged-write resource area and icons of staged resources ..." Therefore, the combination of these two references, even combined, fail to suggest this characteristic. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 32 be withdrawn.

Claims 26, 34 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero in view of Stewart. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 26, 34 and 44.

Dependent claim 26 depends from claim 17 and includes the element of "the resource browser being configured to define a stored resource display area and a staged resource display area, the stored resource display area showing icons of resources that are already stored in the staged-write resource area, the staged resource display area showing icons of staged resources that the user desires to be written to a writable resource area of the staged-write resource area but that have not yet been written to said writable resource area".

The combination of Nero and Stewart fail to teach or suggest the graphical user interface of claim 26.

As discussed above, Nero does not teach or suggest separate "stored resource display" area that shows resources that already stored and a "staged resource display" area that shows resources to be written.

Stewart is cited as teaching "to produce the shared file using some conventional operating systems, the write sends an 'open for write' commence to the operating system, including a filename or other identifier with which to name the file. The operating system may create the file and open it. Additionally, the operating system may lock the file in response to such a command in order to prohibit use of the file by other processes while the file is being written. The writer may receive from some conventional operating systems a pointer or other identifier of the file in response to the open for write command". However, Stewart does not teach elements of "a stored resource display area and a staged resource display area". Therefore, the combination of these two references, even combined, fail to suggest this characteristic. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 24 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 34 depends from claim 27 and includes the element "the resource browser being configured to display icons of stored resources that are already stored in the staged-write resource area and icons of staged resources that the user desires to be written to the staged-write resource area but that have not yet been written to said staged-write resource area; wherein the resource browser shows different representations of the resources depending upon whether they are stored resources or staged resources."

The combination of Nero and Stewart fail to teach or suggest the graphical user interface of claim 34.

 As discussed above, the staged-write area of Nero presented as element 3 of Fig. 1 by the Office, does not provide for separate stored resource and staged resource areas. Element 3 of Fig. 1 further does not "display icons of stored resources that are already stored in the staged-write resource area and icons of staged resources that the user desires to be written to the staged-write resource area"

Stewart is cited for the same teaching as used in rejecting claim 24. However, Stewart provides no suggestion of different representations of the resources. Therefore, the combination of these two references, even combined, fail to suggest this characteristic. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 34 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 44 depends from claim 41 and includes the element of "saving resources in response to requests from application programs; in response to receiving a request from an application program to save a resource on a staged-write storage medium, noting that resource as being staged without writing the resource".

The combination of Nero and Stewart fail to teach or suggest the graphical user interface of claim 44.

As discussed above, Nero describes an application program. Nero does not teach or suggest that as a stand-alone application program that it is capable to save resources in response from request from other application programs.

Stewart is cited for the same teaching as used in rejecting claim 24. However, Stewart provides no suggestion of an operating system that is able to save responses in response from requests from application programs. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 44 be withdrawn.

Claims 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nero, in view of Sexton, in further of Stewart, and in further view of Kuroda. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 46 and 47.

Amended independent claim 46 in particular recites "identifying in a staged-write resource area resources to be written, and in a separate stored resource area resources that have been written".

The combination of Nero, Sexton, Stewart, and Kuroda fail to teach or suggest the computer readable medium of claim 34.

As discussed above, Nero the staged-write area of Nero presented as element 3 of Fig. 1 by the Office, does not provide for separate stored resource and staged resource areas.

Sexton is cited as teaching "storing corresponding references to the designated resources". Stewart is cited as teaching "for any designated resource that is changed prior to writing, creating an unchanged copy of the staged resource and changing the corresponding reference to indicate the unchanged copy". Kuroda is cited as teaching "in response to an instruction to write to the removable storage medium, writing any designated resources and any unchanged copies indicated by the stored references". However, Sexton, Stewart, and Kuroda provide no suggestion as to separate stored resource and staged resource areas.

Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 46 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 47 is allowable by virtue of its dependency on base claim 46. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 47 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

·10

All pending claims 1-9, 11-47 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Dated: 9/10/04

Respectfully Submitted,

By: Emmanuel A. Rivera

Reg. No. 45,760

(509) 324-9256 ext. 245